

C. Remarks

The claims are 1-23, 36 and 42-45 and 54-60, with claims 1, 7, 13, 19-21, 36, 40-42, 54 and 56 being independent. Claims 1-22, 36, 40, 41, 54 and 55 have been withdrawn from consideration as being directed to non-elected inventions. Claims 46-49, 52 and 53 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claim 42 has been amended to clarify the invention. Support for this amendment may be found, *inter alia*, in the cancelled claims. New claims 56-60 have been added and are based on the product claims currently under examination and the disclosure throughout the specification and the other claims. No new matter has been added. Reconsideration of the present claims is expressly requested.

Claims 42-46, 48, 49 and 51-53 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0080712 A1 (Feist). Claim 47 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly obvious from Feist in view of the alleged admissions in the specification at page 4, line 13. The grounds of rejection are respectfully traversed.

Prior to addressing the merits of rejection, Applicant would like to briefly discuss some of the features of the presently claimed invention. That invention, in pertinent part, is related to an anti-vibration device, which includes a first means with a vibration source objection and a second means with a reception object for receiving a signal from the vibration object, which are both arranged on a molded product. This molded product gas-cells that are from 10 to 100 μm . A damping factor of the molded product between the first means and the second means is not less than 35 dB/sec, and a

flexural rigidity of the molded product is from 4,500 to 9,800 Mpa. Such a structure is neither disclosed nor suggested by the cited art.

Feist is directed to methods of retrieving data from storage media.

Applicant respectfully submits that Feist fails to disclose or suggest an anti-vibration device in which a first and a second means are mounted on a molded product as presently claimed. In particular, as the Examiner noted, Feist discusses dampening vibrations at paragraphs [0041]-[0042]. However, Feist does not teach both a vibration source object and a reception object arranged on the molded product. Accordingly, Feist cannot affect the patentability of the presently claimed invention.

Wherefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the claims be allowed and the application be expediently passed to issue.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address given below.

Respectfully submitted,



Jason M. Okun
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 48,512

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

NY_MAIN 564017v1